

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 54-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for reciting non-statutory subject matter. Regarding this rejection, the Applicants would like to thank Examiner Musa for conducting a brief telephone interview and providing helpful suggestions.

Specifically, during the interview Examiner Musa explained that claims 54-58 were rejected because the specification did not clearly describe the computer-readable recording medium as recited in claims 54-58. However, after thoroughly reviewing the specification, it was found that the specification states *"It should be noted that a recording medium recording a program for the router and the set up method of the router according to the present invention includes any computer-readable data storage medium capable of recording the program, including ROM, RAM, floppy discs, CD-ROM, DVD, memory card, or hard disk"* (see paragraph spanning pages 40 and 41 of the substitute specification filed on September 17, 2007).

Therefore, since the specification does describe the computer-readable recording medium, as recited in claims 54-58, it is respectfully submitted that claims 54-58 recite statutory subject matter, as required by 35 U.S.C. § 101 and MPEP §2106.01. Thus, withdrawal of the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection is requested.

Claims 43-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kanekar et al. (U.S. 6,751,191). This rejection is respectfully traversed and believed clearly inapplicable to claims 43-59 for the following reasons.

Independent claim 43 recites a method of starting a first routing device connecting a plurality of networks to which a plurality of routing devices are connected. Further, claim 43 recites (1) requesting, by the first routing device, master router data from each routing device connected to any of the networks to which the first routing device connects (the master router data is stored by each routing device and indicates whether the respective routing device is a master router located on a path to a parent router that assigns the network identification data to identify the networks or a slave router which is a routing device other than the master router). In addition, claim 43 recites (2) disabling a router function of the first routing device when a number of detected master routers connected to any of the networks to which the first routing device connects is zero or two or more, the number being based on acquired master router data received from the routers in response to the requesting of the master router data. Kanekar fails to disclose or suggest above-mentioned distinguishing features (1) and (2) as recited in independent claim 43.

Rather, Kanekar merely teaches reducing a switchover time upon failure of a router by sharing information from a master router to a slave router prior to the failure of the master router. Specifically, Kanekar teaches that this sharing of information allows the slave router to immediately replace the master router upon failure of the master router (see Abstract; and cols. 15 and 16).

Thus, in view of the above, Kanekar teaches sharing information from a master router to a slave router, but fails to disclose or suggest requesting, by the first routing device, master router data from each routing device (the master router data indicating whether the respective routing device is a master router located on a path to a parent router that assigns the network

identification data to identify the networks or a slave router which is a routing device other than the master router), as required by claim 43.

In addition, it is evident that Kanekar, teaches sharing information from a master router to a slave router, but fails to disclose or suggest detecting a number of master routers connected to any of the networks based on acquired master router data received from the routers in response to the requesting of the master router data, as required by claim 43.

Furthermore, it is noted that by detecting the number of master routers connected to any of the other networks, as recited by claim 43, it is possible to judge the possibility of forming a loop path. Therefore, it is clear that the structure required by claim 43 allows judging of the possibility of forming a loop path, which is a feature that is not disclosed or suggested by Kanekar's disclosure of replacing the function of a master router with an existing slave router.

Moreover, Kanekar's teaching of sharing information from a master router to a slave router so that the slave router can replace the function of the master router, once the master router fails, is not a disclosure or suggestion of disabling a router function of the first routing device when a number of detected master routers connected to any of the networks to which the first routing device connects is zero or two or more, as required by claim 43.

In other words, Kanekar's disclosure of using one router to take over the function of a failed router is not a disclosure or suggestion of disabling the function of the first routing device is a certain number of detected master routers is satisfied, as required by claim 43.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 43 and claims 44-47 and 49-59 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Kanekar.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kanekar or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kanekar to obtain the invention of independent claim 43. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 43 and claims 44-47 and 49-59 which depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 48 recites a routing device which includes limitations that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 43. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 48 is allowable over Kanekar.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Reiko UENO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By: 2008.08.29 15:35:23 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 29, 2008